

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of January 8, 2008, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-19 remain pending. No new subject matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is traversed.

The Office Action at page 2 asserts that subject matter related to a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants note that the instant application demonstrates a communication terminal having a processor, wherein the processor is adapted to generate animation in a display by displaying a sequence of images. See the printed publication (U.S. pub. no. 2003/0063090) at Abstract. Furthermore, the printed publication at paragraphs [0024]-[0025] and Figure 2 demonstrates that a processor 18 may be configured to support terminal software, and that processor 18 may be operatively connected to a RAM memory 17a, a SIM card 16 and a Flash ROM 17b via a bus 24. As one of ordinary skill in the art would readily appreciate when reading Applicants' specification, software is typically stored in some type of computer-readable medium such as ROM or a SIM card. Moreover, the printed publication at paragraphs [0025] and [0027]-[0028] demonstrates that processor 18 controls, among other applications, a WAP Browser application 26, where the WAP Browser application 26 supports a picture compression format that provides for "running" animations whenever accessing a WAP page containing animated GIF pictures (and wherein alternative compression formats may be used, including definition of "running times"). In view of the foregoing disclosures, Applicants submit that their specification conveys to one of ordinary skill in the art that they had possession of the invention as set forth in claim 19.

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants

regard as the invention. Applicants have made clarifying amendments to independent claims 1, 8, 17, and 19¹, and thus request withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants refer to the preceding discussion with respect to the section 112, first paragraph, rejection of claim 19, and more specifically, the support provided for claim 19 in the specification. Applicants have amended claim 19 to direct the subject matter recited therein to a computer-readable storage medium (e.g., a ROM or SIM card). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 101 rejection applied to claim 19.

Claim Objections

The Office Action also objects to claims 1, 8, 17 and 19 based on informalities. In view of clarifying amendments to these claims, these objections are believed moot.

Prior Art Rejections

The Office Action at page 8, paragraph 12, asserts that Applicants' arguments with respect to the cited prior art of record have been considered, but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicants thus assume that the Office no longer rejects the claims based on prior art. If it is the Office's intention to maintain the prior art rejections included in the Office Action mailed June 22, 2007, Applicants incorporate herein by way of reference the remarks included in Applicants' Response and Amendment dated October 12, 2007.

¹ Applicants note that claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. See the Office Action at page 2, paragraph 4. The Office Action at pages 2-6, paragraphs 5-8, provides the Office's rationale for the rejection as applied to independent claims 1, 8, and 17. Applicants note that the Office Action at page 6, paragraphs 7 and 8, both refer to claim 17. For purposes of this paper, Applicants presume that Office intended to refer to claim 19 (as opposed to claim 17) in the Office Action at page 6, paragraph 8.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and request notice of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: March 3, 2008

By: **/H. Wayne Porter/**
H. Wayne Porter
Reg. No. 42,084

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001